

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are all the claims pending in the application, new claims 6 and 7 having been added as indicated herein. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. section 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Behr et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 6,104,316), hereinafter referred to as Behr in view of Mohan et al. (an article entitled “Content Adaptation Framework: Bringing the Internet to Information Appliances”, IEEE December 1999, pages 2015-2021), hereinafter referred to as Mohan.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant amends this claim, as indicated herein, and submits that neither of the applied references, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests at least “converts the obtained map information without analyzing content of the obtained map information,” as recited in amended claim 1. That is, even if, *assuming arguendo*, Mohan discloses converting obtained map information, Mohan does not perform such conversion without first analyzing the content of the obtained map information. That is, Mohan describes that such content analysis needs to be performed to extract information that will be useful in transcoding and adaptation. *See Mohan, page 2016, column 2 (§ III. CONTENT ANALYSIS).* Thus, according to Mohan, in order to perform a transcoding operation, a type of content analysis is performed. In fact, Mohan explicitly states that there are two types of content analysis that are performed - 1) resource requirements and content type and purpose. *See pages 2016-2018 of Mohan.* Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references.

With respect to independent claim 4, Applicant amends this claim similar to claim 1, and submits that claim 4 is patentable over the applied references at least for reasons similar to those set forth above for claim 1.

Applicant submits that dependent claims 2, 3, and 5 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 4.

Finally, Applicant adds new claims 6 and 7, as indicated herein, and submits that these claims are patentable over the prior art at least because the prior art does not teach or suggest at least “converts only map information of said at least map information, based on the display description information of said at least one terminal apparatus” and “converts the obtained map information based only on the display description information of said at least one terminal apparatus,” as recited in new claims 6 and 7, respectively.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APPLICATION NO.: 10/086,424

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q67369

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Diallo T. Crenshaw

Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE



23373

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Date: September 30, 2003